

1.0 | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT SUMMARY

The Proposed Project for this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the Coachella General Plan Update 2035. In accordance to California Government Code 65300, the City of Coachella has prepared a long-term plan that will guide development and provide a basis for decision-making for the City through 2035. The Coachella General Plan Update 2035 (CGPU) was developed through a combined effort between community members, City staff, stakeholders, and consultants to form goals, policies, and implementation strategies that will implement the vision of the community. The project's Planning Area encompasses 18,564 acres of City land and 14,755 acres within the City's sphere of influence (SOI). The current population is approximately 40,000, and it is expected to reach 135,000 by 2035. This Program EIR discloses the potential environmental impacts that would result from development under the proposed CGPU.

PROJECT LOCATION

The Project location is in the City of Coachella, at the eastern end of the Coachella Valley, in Riverside County California. Coachella is located southeast of the San Geronio Pass, east of the San Jacinto and Santa Rosa Mountains, north of the Salton Sea 68 feet below sea level. Interstate 10 runs the length of the Coachella Valley, connecting the Coachella with nearby cities and the Southern California region.

AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

During the 30-day NOP/IS scoping period, several comments were received from the public and interested parties. The NOP/IS compiled a primary scope of potentially significant environmental impacts, cumulative impacts, and areas of controversy. The documents were circulated to identify any additional impacts or areas of controversy that may not have been identified in the NOP/IS. The NOP/IS can be found in Appendix 11.1 and the written comments can be found in Appendix 11.2. Through this process the following areas of controversy were identified:

Utilities Infrastructure: The Imperial Irrigation District has cited the expected population growth will require a need for utilities infrastructure to maintain level of service to all existing and new residents and businesses. The IID has identified that the CGPU could create a substantial impact on the IID electrical system. It is also noted that the IID will require rights-of-way to construct and maintain infrastructure, and development of new infrastructure would be funded by the developer.

Water: The Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD) has submitted comments regarding the identification and consideration of multiple agencies and plans associated with water supply, quality and wastewater treatment.

The Initial Study of the CGPU found the project to have no significant impact or less than significant impact in the following areas: Several additional topics were found not to be significant by this Draft Program EIR. The summary of these additional topics can be found in Section 8.0 Effects Found Not to be Significant.

- *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the City of Coachella's Planning Area. The General Plan would not result in safety hazards for people in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Due to the absence of a private airstrip, the General Plan will have no significant impact.

- *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

The General Plan Planning Area is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Because of no existence of a private airstrip, there would be no significant impact created by noise levels.

- *Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan*

Currently there are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites within the City limits. The loss of availability of such sites would not occur in the General Plan Planning Area, and no significant impacts would occur.

The listed potential impacts were determined to not be affected by the CGPU, based on absence of both private airports and locally important mineral resources. The Planning Area does not have private air strips, or is within proximity to impact any private airstrips outside of the Planning Area. The Planning Area also does not possess any resources of local importance, and thus, would experience no impact on locally important mineral resources from the CGPU. Additionally, no comments were made regarding these impact items during the 30-day public review period for the Notice of Preparation and Initial study. Based on findings of "No Significant Impact" for the listed three measures, the items will not be assessed in the Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project. Additionally, other topics were found to also be not significant by the Draft EIR. The summary of these additional topics can be found in Section 8.0, Effects Found Not to be Significant.

SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

Five project alternatives to the proposed project have been considered to address potential development patterns different to those of the CGPU. Each alternative provides a variation on the development guidelines outlined by the CGPU, and is accompanied with respected benefits and impacts. The alternatives include: No Project, Proposed with Distributed Growth, Retail/Entertainment/Job Rich Alternative, Housing Rich Alternative, and Conventional Pattern Alternative. These alternatives have been compared to environmental impacts of the CGPU (Chapter 6) and explain advantages and disadvantages of each alternative's impacts on the existing environment.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

As required by CEQA Section 15126.6 (e) a No Project Alternative is to be analyzed for decision makers to evaluate environmental conditions if the proposed project is not adopted. As outlined in CEQA Guidelines 15126.6 (e) "When the project is the revision of an existing land use or regulatory plan, policy, or ongoing operation, the "no project" alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan, policy or operation into the future." In the case of the proposed project, the No Project alternative for the CGPU would result in the continuation of the Coachella General Plan Update 2020, adopted by the City of Coachella on October 8, 1998. The existing General Plan would continue to be the guiding development plan for the Planning Area. The No Project Alternative would guide growth in the Planning Area to reach approximately 153,000 people by 2020, and include approximately 61,000,000 square feet of non-residential land, and approximately 50,000 dwelling units. The existing General Plan promotes a conventional suburban development pattern that heavily relies on automobiles as the predominant form of transportation.

The Proposed Project anticipates the Planning Area's population growth to reach 135,000 by 2035. This growth is proposed to be somewhat concentrated in the western and central portions of the Planning Area, most closely adjacent to the current urban areas, and extending eastward along Avenue 50 and 52 into the hillsides of Subarea 14. The Distributed Growth alternative would not include any policy that would direct growth to preferred growth subareas or away from future growth areas. It allows for the population to remain at 135,000 by 2035, however the population distribution would be expected to develop more evenly throughout the Planning Area over the course of the next two decades, rather than restricting development in certain areas of the City until later in the planning period after the core of the City is developed by at least 60%. Overall, land use designations and total growth potential for each Subarea would remain as proposed by the CGPU. Additionally, this alternative expects that more development would occur in Subarea 13 by 2035 than expected under the Proposed Project. This would redistribute population density, development, and increase population within the eastern, northern, and southern areas of the Planning Area. This alternative was selected for analysis to address concerns raised by some property owners that any policies that would restrict growth in any Subarea of the City or focus growth in certain areas of the City would interfere with market dynamics.

RETAIL/COMMERCIAL/ENTERTAINMENT RICH ALTERNATIVE

The Retail/Entertainment/Job Rich alternative proposes a stronger emphasis on employment generation within the Downtown Core, on Van Buren, on Harrison, and in the Commercial Entertainment area. The CGPU proposes these areas to be mixed use with neighborhood and regional centers supported by vertically and horizontally mixed residential uses arranged in patterns that support walking, bicycling, and transit. This alternative would shift a mixed-use focus to a higher concentration of employment-oriented uses. This would also decrease the projected population, reduce number of housing units, and

increase jobs within the Planning Area. The proposed alternative could potentially secure more of an economic base for the Planning Area, establish Coachella as an economic anchor for the region, provide more jobs within the Downtown core, and generate a better jobs housing balance for the City. This alternative was chosen to address to concerns. First, the community is generally very interested in economic development and especially in economic development that results in new job opportunities for residents. Second, the propose CGPU would result in a significant unavoidable impact to SR-86 and I-10 due to increased congestion. A project that increases in-town jobs has the potential to help alleviate that congestion by reducing regional trips that originate in Coachella.

HOUSING RICH ALTERNATIVE

The Proposed Project focuses on a mixed housing development pattern with commercial, multi-family residential, and single family residential to be intertwined, and connected to other land uses. The Housing Rich Alternative would focus development on housing, and create more defined single-family residential neighborhoods, with commercial and multi-family residential being developed exclusively outside of neighborhoods along corridors. Non-residential development would be reduced. Compared with the proposed project, this alternative would add an additional 13,000 residents, increase dwelling units by 4,377, and decrease jobs by over 7,000. Additional housing alternative would allow more people to live within the Planning Area, or the Coachella Valley, and benefit from the amenities and unique atmosphere of Coachella and the SOI. Though additional housing offers potential residents a greater housing market to choose from, the shift in increased housing would decrease jobs within the Planning Area. This shift in the jobs-housing balance would increase the number of Coachella residents to seek jobs outside of the Planning Area. This alternative was selected because the City received feedback from a landowner stating that housing was the most viable development opportunity and that the City could not wait years for large scale retail development.

CONVENTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN ALTERNATIVE

The Proposed Project proposes to develop the Planning Area with greater street connectivity, mixed land uses, and closer distances between residential and commercial/retail/civic uses. Additionally, compared to the Proposed Project, the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative would have the same projected population, housing units, and jobs but replace the highly connected pattern of the Proposed Project with a more auto oriented development pattern that would include characteristics such as: separated land uses, wide streets, low intersection density, auto-oriented buildings with large set blocks and road-fronting parking lots, residential neighborhoods separated from other land uses, cul-de-sacs, and disconnected street pattern. This pattern alternative would be in-line with previous development patterns, and has been built in most areas throughout the region. This pattern creates a quiet environment for residential activities to occur in the privacy of each neighborhood, and reduce potential conflicts of residential closely located to commercial, including crime, noise, high levels of non-residential traffic, and air quality.

However, separation of housing, commercial, business, retail, and civic uses creates a street pattern that reduces potential for pedestrians and cyclists to easily and quickly connect to other land uses. The separation also incentivizes the need for vehicle use as non-residential land uses could be located out of comfortable walking or cycling proximity, which could increase vehicle emissions, decrease healthy activities for residents, and create additional traffic volumes within the Planning Area. Conventional development patterns could also prevent certain populations, including young and elderly residents, from accessing civic, commercial, and retail activity, as they may not be able to use a car to move around the Planning Area. Though the Conventional Development Pattern Alternative could create a perceived

predictable urban scape, it would could have potential environmental and social impacts for residents within the Planning Area.

SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123.2 (b) requires an EIR to “describe any significant impacts, including those which can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the Project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect should be described.”

Environmental impact analysis of the Proposed Project determines areas of potentially significant and unavoidable areas of impacts in agriculture and traffic impacts. This DEIR as determined that development under the CGPU would create significant and unavoidable impacts to the visual character of the Planning Area, based on the overall projected growth. The population of the CGPU is expected to more than double the existing population of 40,000. Growth of this proportion would change the aesthetic character of the Planning Area, as new houses, commercial land, and industrial uses would also grow to accommodate the project population. Even with the proposed CGPU policies that help reduce visual impacts the overall quantity of physical changes under the CGPU would be significant and unavoidable.

Implementation of the CGPU would also result in the conversion of agricultural resources in the City of Coachella and within its Sphere of Influence. The CGPU would result in the conversion 9,862 acres of farmland to urbanized uses. Of this acreage, 5,662 acres of Prime Farmland would be converted, 3,613 acres of Farmland of Local Importance would be converted, 587 acres of Unique Farmland would be converted, and 3,613 acres of Farmland of Local importance would be converted. Similarly, implementation of the CGPU would likely result in conflicts with lands currently under Williamson Act contracts. Finally, implementation of the CGPU, in consideration of Countywide and region-wide development of agricultural resources, would result in cumulative impacts to agricultural resources. Implementation of the proposed project would result. All three of these impacts would significant and unavoidable.

Circulation impacts are determined to be significant and unavoidable for road segments along SR-86 South and Grapefruit Boulevard. These facilities are impacted by both by the proposed project and also by the growth in areas outside of Coachella because these roadways are regional facilities that serve both local and regional traffic. As such, the impact to these facilities cannot be fully mitigated and the impact remains significant and unavoidable.

Table 1.0-1: Impacts Overview Matrix

Issues	Determination Of Significance	Mitigation Measure
I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:		
a) Have substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within the state scenic highway?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Significant and Unavoidable	No Mitigation Feasible
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or night views in the area.	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:		
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	Significant and Unavoidable	No Mitigation Feasible
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	Significant and Unavoidable	No Mitigation Feasible
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural uses?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary

III. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:		
<p>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>Less than Significant With Mitigation</p>	<p>Mitigation measure: Prior to adoption of the Final EIR and CGPU, update CGPU Chapter 7 with new policy. Policy will state: Require projects proposing to develop in subareas 5, 6, and 7 to conduct survey to determine if there is occurrence of sensitive species within the project area. If sensitive species are present, projects must implement mitigation measures necessary as prescribed by a qualified biologist and approved by any applicable resource agency in order to receive necessary City permits.</p>
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>c) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>

<p>d) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>		
<p>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource [inclusive of archaeological resources] which is either listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historic Resources, or a local register of historic resources?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resources (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type, or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person)?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>

<p>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure: Prior to adoption of the Final EIR and CGPU, update CGPU to add policy in Chapter 7 that states: In areas where there is a high chance that human remains may be present, require proposed projects to conduct survey to establish occurrence of human remains, if any. If human remains are discovered on proposed project sites, the project must implement mitigation measures to prevent impacts to human remains in order to receive permit approval.</p>
<p>V. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Does the project:</p>		
<p>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>b) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving strong Seismic Ground Shaking?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>

c) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
d) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving landslides?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
e) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
f) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
g) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
h) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
i) Would the Project result in loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
j) Would the Project result in loss of availability of locally important mineral resources recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or any other land use plan.	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary

VI. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:		
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous material into the environment?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	No Mitigation Necessary

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
VII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:		
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of a site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
e) Contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood hazard boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
h) Place within 100-year flood hazard area structure, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary

<p>III. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:</p>		
<p>a) Physically divide an established community?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>IX. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:</p>		
<p>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. For roadway facilities in the City of Coachella, this impact is evaluated in terms of LOS D thresholds for roadways and intersections?</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable for regional roadways including SR-86 South and Grapefruit Boulevard. Less than significant with mitigation for City roadways</p>	<p>Within one year of adoption of the CGPU, the City shall update its Development Impact Fee (DIF) program to establish a plan and funding mechanism that provides for the implementation of all of the roadway improvements identified in the Mobility Element.</p>

<p>b) Conflict with the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Congestion Management Program (CMP), including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the RCTC for designated roads or highways?</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>	<p>No Mitigation Feasible</p>
<p>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) or impede emergency vehicle access?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>e) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>X. NOISE. Would the project:</p>		
<p>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess groundbourne vibration or groundbourne noise levels?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
e) Expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from a public or private airport within two miles of the project area?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
XI. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:		
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
b) Generate construction-related emissions that may result in temporary adverse impacts to local air quality?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
c) Create long-term emissions associated with future development facilitated by the General Plan Update exceed levels in regional forecasts?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
d) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or project air quality violation?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
XII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:		
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:		
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
XIV. UTILITIES. Would the Project:		
a) Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service or to meet performance objectives for Natural Gas, Electricity, or Telecommunication?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
b) Would the project result in wasteful energy consumption?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
c) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
d) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary

<p>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project: result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p>		
<p>a) Fire Protection?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>b) Police protection?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>c) Schools?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>d) Parks?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>e) Medical Core?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>XVI. WATER SUPPLY. Would the project:</p>		
<p>a) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>

c) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment or collection facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
d) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
e) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
f) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary
g) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project' s projected demand in addition to the provider' s existing commitments?	Less Than Significant	No Mitigation Necessary

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNFIGANCE.		
<p>a) a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plan to animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history of prehistory?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly?</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>	<p>No Mitigation Necessary</p>